

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-10 and 20-30. Claims 1-10 and 20-30 are rejected. Claims 1 and 20 are amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least at page 22, line 22 – page 25, line 2.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-10 and 20-30

Claims 1-10 and 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cannon (US 6,286,005). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-10 and 20-30 are patentable over Cannon for at least the following rationale.

Independent Claims 1 and 20 recite, in part, “wherein said specified distribution of said plurality of tasks is in a vector format” (emphasis added). Claims 2-10 and 21-30 that depend from Claims 1 and 20, respectively, also include these embodiments.

MPEP §2131 provides:

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Cannon does not anticipate “wherein said specified distribution of said plurality of tasks is in a vector format,” as claimed (emphasis added). Applicants understand Cannon to disclose a distribution that is not in a vector format. In particular, Cannon discloses “The present advertising plan has or schedule has just three advertisements: spot A, spot B, and spot C” (col. 39, lines 6-7). Moreover, the instant Office Action states “said specified distribution being *ad spots A, B and C*, in the *Scoring Example*, col. 38, lines 65 to col. 39 line 7” (para 4). Applicants do not understand the listing of three ad spots to be in a vector format. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Cannon does not anticipate “wherein said specified distribution of said plurality of tasks is in a vector format,” as claimed (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Cannon does not satisfy a prima facie case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 20 are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit Cannon also does not render obvious the additional claimed features as recited in Claims 2-10 and 21-30 that depend from Claims 1 and 20, respectively. Therefore, Claims 2-10 and 21-30 are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-10 and 20-30 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: May 23, 2011

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076 USA
(408) 377-0500